

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 20, 23-24 and 26-28 will be active in the application subsequent to entry of this Amendment.

Applicants have taken due note of the examiner's comments in the discussion bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Official Action concerning the scope of the claims relative to the comparative evidence contained not only in the application as filed but also in the declaration of Mr. Kometani made June 6, 2006 submitted with the Amendment of June 7, 2006. Applicants submit that at the very least the evidence of record demonstrates that the use of methacrylic acid or tiglic acid as the aliphatic monocarboxylic acid in the catalyst leads to unexpectedly improved and persuasive results. The specific monocarboxylic acids were previously claimed in the claims 21 and 25, however these claims have been written in independent form and now appear as new claims 27 and 28 (claims 21 and 25 being canceled as redundant).

The sole issue raised in the outstanding Official Action is the rejection of previous claims 20, 21 and 23-26 over the prior art documents identified in item 3 of the Official Action.


The prior art-based rejection is inappropriate, particularly considering comparative evidence now at hand from both the specification as well as the declaration evidence of record. Applicants have found that because in the polyurethane-forming systems used in the cited references, there is no need to use a catalyst which can delay the onset of polyurethane-forming reaction. None of the cited references suggest, among the various bicyclic amidine salts with numerous acids disclosed therein, which salt is suitable for a two component sealant using an unblocked polyisocyanate, not a blocked isocyanate prepolymer as in Hannah et al. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed.

Reconsideration and allowance are solicited. At the very least it would appear that claims 27 and 28 are consistent with the scope of the evidence presented and at least these claims should be allowed.

KOMETANI et al
Appl. No. 10/724,608
May 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Arthur R. Crawford
Reg. No. 25,327

ARC:eaw
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100